

Coulomb Ordering in Anderson-Localized Electron Systems.

A. A. Slutskin¹, M. Pepper², and H. A. Kovtun¹.

¹*Institute for Low Temperature Physics and Engineering, 47 Lenin Ave., Kharkov, Ukraine.*

²*Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK*

We consider an electron system under conditions of strong Anderson localization, taking into account interelectron long-range Coulomb repulsion. We have established that with the electron density going to zero the Coulomb interaction brings the arrangement of the Anderson localized electrons closer and closer to an ideal (Wigner) crystal lattice, provided the temperature is sufficiently low and the dimension of the system is > 1 . The ordering occurs despite the fact that a random spread of the energy levels of the localized one-electron states, exceeding the mean Coulomb energy per electron, renders it impossible the electrons to be self-localized due to their mutual Coulomb repulsion. This differs principally the Coulomb ordered Anderson localized electron system (COALES) from Wigner crystal, Wigner glass, and any other ordered electron or hole system that results from the Coulomb self-localization of electrons/holes. The residual disorder inherent to COALES is found to bring about a multi-valley ground-state degeneration akin to that in spin glass. With the electron density increasing, COALES is revealed to turn into Wigner glass or a glassy state of a Fermi-glass type depending on the width of the random spread of the electron levels.

PACS number(s): 71.45.-d, 72.15.Rn, 73.20.-r, 73.40.-c

a. Introduction. As was shown by Wigner long ago¹, slow decrease in the Coulomb electron-electron interaction potential $v(r) = e^2/\kappa r$ (e is the free electron charge, r is a distance between the interacting electrons, κ is the permittivity) with an increase in the interelectron distance inevitably causes the Coulomb energy of free electron gas to exceed its kinetic energy at sufficiently low electron densities with the resulting transition of the gas into an electron crystal (Wigner crystal). In the wake of Wigner's prediction a natural question was raised whether long-range (weakly screened) Coulomb forces can lead to ordering of charge carrier ensembles in conductors. However, a strong evidence of "Wigner-crystal-in-crystal" existence has not been found yet. This suggests that the Wigner crystallization, at least in the conventional conductors, is very difficult (if at all possible) to observe in pure form. Therefore, seeking mechanisms of charge carrier Coulomb ordering that are beyond the above Wigner's scenario is of great interest.

At present much attention is being given to an electron/hole Coulomb self-localization in lattice systems with so small overlap integral t that tunnelling of charge carriers is suppressed by their mutual Coulomb interaction. The self-localization brings about electron/hole ordering in two cases: i/the host lattice is regular (generally an incommensurate electron/hole structure is formed^{2,3}), ii/the host lattice is disordered, but the mean separation of its sites is much less than that of the charge carriers $\bar{r}$ (the so-called Wigner glass is formed, whose space structure, though disordered, is close to a Wigner crystal lattice (WCL)⁴ in a sense⁵). Ordered self-localized charge carrier lattice systems (OSLCCLS) of both types are obviously not the same as Wigner crystal. In addition, unlike the Wigner crystallization, the higher is the electron/hole density the weaker are dynamic effects caused by the charge carrier tunnelling.

The present paper aims to draw attention to a new

type of Coulomb ordering that occurs under conditions of a strong Anderson localization. Specifically, we deal with Anderson localized electron systems wherein the external random field localizing the electrons is a random set of potential wells that are sufficiently deep for the localization length r_L to be $\lesssim$ the mean wells separation, $r_0 \sim n_0^{-1/d}$ (n_0 is the density of the wells, d is the dimension of the system). We show further that at sufficiently low electron densities, n_e , and sufficiently low temperatures, T , the mutual Coulomb repulsion of the localized electrons inevitably forces them to be arranged close to the WCL sites, provided $d > 1$. Such Coulomb ordered Anderson localized electron system (COALES) differs qualitatively from both Wigner crystal and OSLCCLS for the following reason. An electron/hole self-localization underlying formation of Wigner crystal or OSLCCLS occurs only if the *Coulomb energy of mutual charge carrier repulsion is the prevailing one*. In the electron systems undergoing strong Anderson localization this is not the case, as the width of *random spread of the electron levels in the wells*, Δ (the disorder energy) is much more than the mean Coulomb energy per electron $\varepsilon_c \sim v(\bar{r})$. Under these conditions a Coulomb self-localization is impossible since a shift of an electron over a small distance $\sim r_0 \ll \bar{r}$ changes the electron energy much more than ε_c . Below we describe a new mechanism by which Coulomb ordering occurs despite the inequality $\varepsilon_c \ll \Delta$.

The smallness of ε_c as compared with Δ is believed to be a good reason to describe an influence of Coulomb electron-electron interaction on the systems with strong Anderson localization in terms of Fermi glass,⁶ a random system of the electrons occupying all wells with the energies $\leq$ the Fermi energy ε_F . Up to now, it is the Fermi-glass approximation modified with regard to existence of the so-called Coulomb gap (Efros-Shklovskii gap)⁷ at the Fermi energy has been the basic approach to the problem. COALES existence at low n_e is beyond

the scope of the Fermi-glass concept. This indicates that the conventional line of reasoning should be revised.

COALES possesses a peculiar “duality”: similar to Wigner crystal, it arises as $n_e \rightarrow 0$, while its space structure similar to that of Wigner glass. As will be seen from the following, such “duality” not only differs COALES from both Wigner crystal and Wigner glass but imparts it a number of new features that make COALES an appealing subject of investigation. We also show that with an increase in n_e COALES turns into Fermi glass or OSLCCLS depending on a value of the parameter $\gamma = \Delta/v(r_0)$, governing an interplay between the random spread of the electron levels and the Coulomb interelectron repulsion. The residual disorder inherent to COALES is described here in terms of *dipole glass*, a random system of interacting dipoles that issue from the WCL sites. The dipole representation of the disorder proves to be helpful for revealing a multi-valley degeneracy of the COALES ground state reminiscent of that in the spin glasses.

b. The Basic Assumptions. Owing to the inequality $r_L \lesssim r_0$ the radius-vectors $\vec{R}$ of the centers of the random-potential wells can be considered as quantum numbers of the one-electron localized states, $|\vec{R}\rangle$. Their energies $\varepsilon(\vec{R})$ are random values, the structure of the $\vec{R}$ set is assumed to be arbitrary, in particular, it can be regular. Without essential loss of generality, the density ν of the number of $\varepsilon(\vec{R})$ with a given value ε can be presented in the form

$$\nu = n_0 f(\varepsilon)/\Delta, \quad (1)$$

where $f(\varepsilon)$ is ~ 1 within the interval $[\varepsilon_{\min}, \varepsilon_{\min} + \Delta]$ and equals zero outside it; $\varepsilon_{\min}$ is the least of the $\varepsilon(\vec{R})$. Further we put $\varepsilon_{\min} = 0$, $f(0) = 1$.

Here it is assumed that $\bar{r} \gg r_0$. In particular, this allows to neglect perturbations produced in the eigenstates of the system by the electron-electron interaction (with accuracy to additions $\sim (r_0/\bar{r})^2 \exp(-r_0/r_L) \ll 1$). In this approximation, the eigenstates can be identified with

$$|\mathcal{R}\rangle = |\vec{R}_1\rangle > |\vec{R}_2\rangle > \dots |\vec{R}_N\rangle. \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \vec{R}_1, \dots, \vec{R}_N$ denotes a set of the wells occupied by the electrons, N is the number of the electrons. The complete set of the eigenstates comprises all possible $\mathcal{R}$ with different $\vec{R}_1 \dots \vec{R}_N$. With the same accuracy, the eigenvalues $E(\mathcal{R})$ corresponding to the states $|\mathcal{R}\rangle$ take the form

$$E(\mathcal{R}) = E_c(\mathcal{R}) + E_w(\mathcal{R}), \quad (3a)$$

where E_c and E_w are the energy of the mutual electron repulsion and the energy of the non-interacting Anderson localized electrons in the wells, respectively:

$$E_c = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,k=1 \\ i \neq k}}^N v(|\vec{R}_i - \vec{R}_k|), \quad E_w = \sum_{i=1}^N \varepsilon(\vec{R}_i); \quad (3b)$$

We aim to find the structure of the electron configuration $\mathcal{R}_g$ that minimizes $E(\mathcal{R})$.

c. Electron Ordering and Fermi-Glass Instability. First let us discuss how mutual electron repulsion affects the ground state of the Fermi-glass in the limit $n_e \rightarrow 0$. As follows from Eq.(1), n_e is linear in ε_F at $\varepsilon_F \ll \Delta$:

$$n_e = n_0 \varepsilon_F / \Delta,$$

On the other hand, ε_c is proportional to $n_e^{1/d}$. Hence, the ratio $\varepsilon_F/\varepsilon_c \propto n_e^{\frac{d-1}{d}}$ tends to zero (for $d > 1$) with a decrease in n_e . What this means is that Fermi glass with sufficiently low n_e is *unstable* with respect to mutual Coulomb repulsion of electrons.

If the electrons were free to move and $\varepsilon(\vec{R}) = 0$, the ground-state configuration $\mathcal{R}_g$ would be a WCL. Since the electrons of Fermi glass are *randomly* arranged, the Coulomb energy per electron of the Fermi-glass exceeds that of the WCL, $\varepsilon_0 \sim \varepsilon_c$, significantly (i.e. by a value $\sim \varepsilon_c$). This suggests that for sufficiently low n_e the configuration $\mathcal{R}_g$ falls into a class of $\mathcal{R}$ that meet the following conditions: i/ for each WCL site there is an electron located in a small neighborhood of the site, ii/ the upper bound ε_b of the electron energies in the wells $\varepsilon(\vec{R}_1), \dots, \varepsilon(\vec{R}_N)$ satisfies the inequalities

$$\varepsilon_F \ll \varepsilon_b \ll \varepsilon_c, \quad (4)$$

The energy per electron $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{R}} = E(\mathcal{R})/N$ of such $\mathcal{R}$ is near ε_0 . It cannot be less than ε_0 as the mean electron energy in the wells $\varepsilon_w = E_w/N \geq \varepsilon_F$.

Any configuration of the above class belongs to the set of points $\vec{R}$ for which $\varepsilon(\vec{R}) \leq \varepsilon_b$. The density of these points equals $n_0(\varepsilon_b/\Delta)$, and their mean separation

$$\rho(\varepsilon_b) \sim r_0(\Delta/\varepsilon_b)^{1/d}, \quad (5)$$

is much less than the WCL spacing $a_0 \sim \bar{r}$ owing to the first of the inequalities (4). Therefore, for each WCL site $\vec{m}$ there are inevitably several $\vec{R}$ of the set such that $|\vec{R} - \vec{m}| \sim \rho$. Populating these “proximate” states $|\vec{R}\rangle$ (one electron per site) yields just the configurations of the class we are interested in. For such a configuration the energy $\varepsilon_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the sum

$$\varepsilon_{\mathcal{R}} = \varepsilon_0 + \delta\varepsilon, \quad (6a)$$

where $\delta\varepsilon$ is expected to be a small correction to ε_0 . It consists of two terms:

$$\delta\varepsilon = a(\rho/\bar{r})^2 \varepsilon_0 + b(r_0/\rho)^d \Delta \quad (6b)$$

The first term is the deformation energy produced by electron displacements over distances $\sim \rho$ from the WCL sites. The second term is ε_w expressed in terms of ρ in view of Eq.(5) and the fact that $\varepsilon_w \sim \varepsilon_b$. Factors $a = a(\mathcal{R})$, $b = b(\mathcal{R})$ depend on details of $\mathcal{R}$, but they are both ~ 1 for any of the considered configurations.

The ground-state correction, $\delta\varepsilon_g$, to ε_0 is the least of the $\delta\varepsilon$ values. Putting $a, b = 1$ in the expression (6b) and finding its minimum in ρ , we obtain the estimate

$$\delta\varepsilon_g \sim \gamma^{\frac{2}{d+2}} (r_0/\bar{r})^{\frac{2(d-1)}{d+2}} \varepsilon_0, \quad (7)$$

the minimum being reached at

$$\rho = \bar{\rho} \sim \gamma^{\frac{1}{d+2}} (r_0/\bar{r})^{\frac{d-1}{d+2}} a_0 \sim (\Delta/\delta E_c)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} r_0, \quad (8)$$

where γ is the parameter defined in item a; the physical sense of the energy $\delta E_c = (r_0/\bar{r})^2 \varepsilon_c$ will be explained below (item e). The quantity $\bar{\rho}$ characterizes deviation of $\mathcal{R}_g$ from WCL.

Expressions (7) and (8) show that $\delta\varepsilon_g/\varepsilon_0$ and $\bar{\rho}/a_0$ both go to zero when $\bar{r}/r_0 \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, for sufficiently low n_e the ground-state electron configuration is WCL slightly perturbed by random electron displacements from the WCL sites. This is just the COALES mentioned in the item a. The space structure of COALES differs from that of Wigner glass⁵ at an important point: the typical displacement of the electrons/holes from the WCL sites in Wigner glass is of order of the geometrical constant of the system, the mean host-lattice sites separation, while that in COALES, $\bar{\rho}$, depends not only on the geometrical parameter r_0 but also on both the disorder energy Δ and the electron density.

d. Dipole Glass. In order to do justice to the COALES ground state it is necessary to describe the residual disorder inherent to this system, extending the consideration to cover all $\mathcal{R}$ that are close to $\mathcal{R}_g$. To this end, it is convenient to introduce the effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} by the formula $E(\mathcal{R}) = N\varepsilon_0 + H_{\text{eff}}$, expressing H_{eff} in terms of dipoles $\vec{d}_{\vec{m}} = \vec{R} - \vec{m}$ as independent variables ($\vec{m}$ are the radius-vectors of the WCL sites) whose moduli are $\ll a_0$. Expanding E_c in powers of $d_{\vec{m}}^\alpha$ (index α enumerates the components of vectors) and restricting to quadratic in $\vec{d}_{\vec{m}}$ terms, it is easy to obtain

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\vec{m}} \tilde{\varepsilon}(\vec{d}_{\vec{m}}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{m}, \vec{m}'} \Lambda_{\alpha\alpha'}(\vec{m} - \vec{m}') d_{\vec{m}}^\alpha d_{\vec{m}'}^{\alpha'}, \quad (9)$$

where matrix $\Lambda_{\alpha\alpha'}(\vec{m}) = |\vec{m}|^{-3}(\delta_{\alpha\alpha'} - 3m_\alpha m_{\alpha'})/|\vec{m}|^2$ determines the interaction of two dipoles issuing from sites $0, \vec{m}$; the function $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\vec{d}_{\vec{m}}) = \varepsilon(\vec{m} + \vec{d}_{\vec{m}}) + \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\alpha'} d_{\vec{m}}^\alpha d_{\vec{m}}^{\alpha'}$, the matrix $\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\alpha'} = -\sum_{\vec{m}} \Lambda_{\alpha\alpha'}(\vec{m})$; here and further on summation over repeated indexes α, α' is implied, the sums of $\vec{m}, \vec{m}'$ are taken over all WCL sites. The second term in $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\vec{d}_{\vec{m}})$ is the energy of interaction of a given dipole with WCL; the second term in Eq.(9) is the energy of the dipole-dipole interaction.

The distinctive feature of H_{eff} is that the dipoles are variables taking on their values on a given *random* set. This suggests that the considered dipole system has much in common with the spin glass⁸. The analogy becomes clear for the simplest model in which $\vec{d}_{\vec{m}} = d_0 s_{\vec{m}} \vec{e}_{\vec{m}}$, $s_{\vec{m}} = \pm 1$, d_0 is a constant, and unit vectors $\vec{e}_{\vec{m}}$ constitute a given random set, H_{eff} taking the form

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\vec{m} \neq \vec{m}'} J_{\vec{m}\vec{m}'} s_{\vec{m}} s_{\vec{m}'} + \sum_{\vec{m}} h(s_{\vec{m}}), \quad (10)$$

where $s_{\vec{m}}$ are the independent variables, the “exchange integral” $J_{\vec{m}\vec{m}'} = d_0^2 \Lambda_{\alpha\alpha'}(\vec{m} - \vec{m}') e_{\vec{m}}^\alpha e_{\vec{m}'}^{\alpha'}$, is a *random* matrix, and $h(s_{\vec{m}}) = \tilde{\varepsilon}(d_0 s_{\vec{m}} \vec{e}_{\vec{m}})$ plays the role of an external random field. The system with the Hamiltonian (10), being a special case of spin glass⁸, shares with the spin glasses their known general property: a multi-valley ground-state degeneration. It can be described in terms of “ $\mathcal{N}$ -excitations” that are $s_{\vec{m}}$ configurations differing from the ground-state one by a big number $\mathcal{N}$ of spin flips. The multi-valley degeneration implies that separation of the low bound of the $\mathcal{N}$ -excitations energy spectrum from the ground-state energy is $\sim$ the typical separation between the neighboring energies of the spectrum, $\delta E_{\mathcal{N}} \propto \mathcal{N}/Z$ (Z is the total number of $\mathcal{N}$ -excitations with a given $\mathcal{N}$, $\ln Z \propto \mathcal{N}$), and in consequence of this, is *exponentially small in $\mathcal{N}$* .

The true dipole Hamiltonian (9) differs from the model one (10) only in that each dipole $\vec{d}_{\vec{m}}$ runs through a given finite random set containing more than two vectors. (The vectors of the set are such that their moduli are comparable with $\bar{\rho}$). Therefore, the above properties of the energy spectrum of the $\mathcal{N}$ -excitations (they are dipole configurations with $\mathcal{N}$ dipoles other than in the ground state) hold in the general case. In other words, the multi-valley degeneration does take place in the dipole system, and hence, in COALES.

e. The Region of COALES Existence. Expression (8) shows that with an increase in n_e the ratio $\bar{\rho}/a_0$ increases, while $\bar{\rho}$ itself decreases. This brings about, depending on a value of the parameter γ , two different scenarios of what happens with COALES as n_e increases. For sufficiently big γ the ratio $\bar{\rho}/a_0$, increasing together with n_e , reaches inevitably some critical value $\beta < 1/2$ at which the length of the space correlations in the system is $\sim \bar{r}$, and COALES turns (supposedly, by a second order transition) into a *glassy state*. This occurs at

$$n_e = n_{e1} \sim \beta_c^{\frac{d(d+2)}{d-1}} \gamma^{-\frac{d}{d-1}} n_0.$$

At this point the ratio $\varepsilon_F/\varepsilon_c$ is $\sim \beta^{d+2}$, i.e. it is significantly less than 1. Therefore, for $n_e \geq n_{e1}$ there exists a n_e range over which the glassy state cannot be adequately described in terms of the notion of Fermi energy. A further decrease in n_e leads to transformation of such “non-Fermi” glass into conventional Fermi glass (modified by the Coulomb electron-electron interactions) only if $\gamma \geq 1$. Otherwise, $\varepsilon_F/\varepsilon_c \sim \gamma(n_e/n_0)^{\frac{d-1}{d}}$ is less than 1 for any n_e , and non-Fermi glass exists for all $n_e \geq n_{e1}$.

If γ is sufficiently small, an increase in n_e reduces $\bar{\rho}$ down to its least possible value, r_0 , the ratio $\bar{\rho}/a_0$ remaining $\ll 1$. This takes place at $\Delta \sim \delta E_c$, or in terms of n_e , at $n_e = n_{e2} \sim \gamma^{\frac{d}{3}} n_0$. The parameter δE_c is the typical change in the Coulomb energy of the system as an electron is shifted over distance $\sim r_0$. Therefore, for

$\delta E_c > \Delta$ the mutual electron repulsion dominates the random spread of the electron levels, causing localization of the electrons by itself. In other words, in the considered case the state into which COALES turns as n_e increases is nothing but the above-mentioned OSLCCLS whose host lattice is a regular or disordered $\vec{R}$ set.

It follows from the aforesaid that the region of COALES existence on the n_e, γ -plane is restricted by γ -axis and two curves, $n_e = n_{e1}(\gamma)$, $n_e = n_{e2}(\gamma)$ ($n_{e1}(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$; $n_{e2}(0) = 0$). They intersect at point $n_e = \bar{n}_e \sim \beta^d n_0$, $\gamma = \bar{\gamma} \sim \beta^3$, the value $\bar{n}_e$ being the maximal n_e at which COALES exists.

Heating affects COALES if T exceeds $\delta \varepsilon_g$, both terms in Eq.(6b) ($\rho = \bar{\rho}$) being $\sim T$. This gives the dipole thermal-fluctuations amplitude $d_T \sim \bar{r}(\varepsilon_c/T)^{1/2}$, the fluctuating dipole vector taking $\sim (T/\delta \varepsilon_g)^{1+d/2}$ values. As T increases, d_T becomes $\sim a_0$, and at some critical $T \sim \varepsilon_c$ COALES turns into a glassy state.

f. Some General Features of COALES. Macroscopically, COALES manifests both electron crystal and glassy-state features.

Due to the proximity of the COALES space structure to WCL the low bound of the energy spectrum of one-electron excitations produced by displacements of an electron over distances $\gg \bar{r}$ is separated from the ground state energy by a big gap $\sim \varepsilon_c$. This renders one-electron variable-range hopping over COALES impossible. Low-temperature conduction in COALES is by multi-electron exchange processes of a creep type (a power dependence of the COALES conductivity σ on T is expected) or by transfer of charged point defects (positively charged WCL vacancies and interstitial electrons), σ being proportional to their concentration that in its turn is $\propto \exp((\varepsilon_v - \varepsilon_i)/T)$ (ε_v and $\varepsilon_i > \varepsilon_v$ are the energies of vacancy and interstitial-electron formation respectively; $\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_v < \varepsilon_c$). Thus, σ by no means obeys the known Mott's law⁶ for Fermi glass.

The multi-valley degeneration of the dipole glass, similarly to that in spin glass⁸, is bound to cause an infinite spectrum of relaxation times, and, in consequence of this, a non-ergodic behavior of COALES. This can be revealed by observation of different relaxation processes in COALES proceeding for anomalously long times. An example is relaxation of a non-equilibrium COALES polarization created in one way or another. This has much in common with relaxation of a non-equilibrium magnetic moment in spin glass.⁸

As follows from the aforesaid, under moderate-disorder conditions ($\Delta \lesssim v(r_0)$) COALES can exist up to n_e that are only several times less than n_0 . The proper materials to observe COALES are various amorphous narrow-band conductors, superlattices, and inversion layers wherein n_e can be varied within wide limits without affecting the disorder. Favorable conditions for two-dimensional COALES existence are expected to be realized in semiconductor superlattices with the so-called δ -layers. Of special interest is a conductive sheet in a system *metal*

— *n*-type *GaAs* — *p*-type *GaAs* with charge transfer in an impurity band.⁹ It is distinguished by pronounced regular-type oscillations in n_e , which cannot be explained in conventional one-electron terms and most likely are a manifestation of two-dimensional COALES or OSLCCLS. We intend to provide new evidence to confirm the suggestion and to specify the electron structure in nearest future.

The main outlines of COALES mentioned here are to be issues of our further detailed publications.

We gratefully acknowledge interesting and useful discussions with I.Lerner and I.Yurkevich. We are sincerely thankful to B.Shklovskii for helpful remarks.

The visit of A. Slutskin to the Cavendish Laboratory was supported by the Royal Society. AS would like to express his gratitude.

¹ E. Wigner, Trans. Farad. Soc., **34**, 678 (1938)

² Hubbard J., Phys. Rev. B **17**, 494 (1978).

³ A.A. Slutskin, V.V. Slavin, and H.E. Kovtun, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 14184 (2000)

⁴ To avoid confusion, it should be noted that here and further on we use this term, for the sake of shortness, only to designate the electron/hole ideal crystal lattice that would realize the absolute minimum of the Coulomb electron/hole repulsion energy if the electrons/holes were free to move.

⁵ M.S. Bello, E.I. Levin, B.I. Shklovskii, A.L. Efros JETP **53**, 822 (1981). We refer to the paper in which Wigner glass was predicted, though the term itself appeared, to our knowledge, later.

⁶ N.F. Mott, E.A. Davis, *Electron Processes in Non-crystalline Materials* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1979)

⁷ A.L. Efros, B.I. Shklovskii, J. Phys. **C8**, L49 (1975)

⁸ K. Binder, A.P. Young, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58**, 801 (1986)

⁹ M. Pepper, J. Phys. C **12**, L617 (1979)